DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 826 FL 020 525

AUTHOR Carter, Ronald
TITLE Some Pawns for Kingman: Language Education and English Teaching.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 17p.; In: Grunwell, Pamela, Ed. Applied Linguistics in Society. Papers from the Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics (20th, Nottingham, England, United Kingdom, September 1987. British Studies in Applied Linguistics, 3; see FL 020 520.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Curriculum Design; Educational Philosophy; Educational Strategies; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Interprofessional Relationship; *Language Research; Language Teachers; *Linguistic Theory; Persuasive Discourse; Researchers; Second Language Instruction; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Textbooks; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

A discussion of the state of second language education and English teaching in Britain focuses on the role of applied linguistics in the field. Four major points are made: that (1) books on language are not common in the syllabi of language teacher education; (2) current philosophies on language teaching appear to be either reactionary or romantic in nature; (3) applied linguists, if they want to promote language awareness and knowledge of linguistics in the field of English language education, must show greater understanding of the aims and objectives of English teachers; and (4) the arguments in favor of applied linguistics must be carefully and persistently articulated. Comments are made in the context of the British educational philosophy and system. Two promising developments in English language curriculum design are discussed: Australian research in language activity and curricular genre (narrative, argumentation, summary, report, expository writing, description), and recent changes in the British advanced English language curriculum. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350826

SOME PAWNS FOR KINGMAN: LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND ENGLISH TEACHING

Ronald Carter
University of Nottingham Department of English Studies

Introduction

My aims in this paper are to examine some features of the current debate surrounding English teaching in this country, and to try to explain why it has something of the character it has. To do this, I have spent time reading and re-reading books and government reports on English teaching going back to the Newbolt Report of 1921. I have given particular attention to books which a survey I recently undertook showed to be the most core text books used in English curriculum and methods courses for P.G.C.E. and B.Ed. pre-service teachers. For applied linguists, even for those like myself with a literary background and who teach literature in a University English department, it makes depressing reading. Books on language do *not* figure at all prominently. This should, however, come as no surprise for opposition between language and literature teaching has a long history.

The other points I wish to make are as follows:

(i) Detailed examination of the current aims and objectives of English teachers is an essential prerequisite to any consideration of the terms of reference of the Kingman committee. This will necessarily involve some historical reflections, since the ideologies underlying aims and objectives are determined or at least shaped in specific historical contexts.

(ii) Applied linguists do not generally seem to engage directly with these aims and objectives, or with their historical shadowings when they write about English language education, language awareness programmes, stylistics and the teaching of literature, and so on. In fact, a main point throughout this paper is that applied linguists committed to a higher profile for language in English teaching, need to show greater understanding of what is important to English teachers. Failure to understand, or at least, to engage with such positionings will mean that arguments for a greater linguistic underpinning to the subject, and to the training of teachers for the subject, fail to carry conviction because they do not deal with central issues.

(iii) It is only by powerful *arguments* that shifts in attitude and orientation take place. It may be in itself naive to believe this, but it is at least my observation that the HMI discussion documents *English 5-16* were generally weak in argumentation, particularly in anticipating counter-arguments. The result was what came to be seen by many people as a retreat, or at best, a beleaguered position concerning a more central place for language in the English classroom. If recommendations made by the Kingman committee peter

FL 020 525

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Hawkins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

out through lack of resources, that would be disappointing; but it would not be as disappointing as failing to carry conviction and losing the argument for more langauge-based work. The counter-arguments English teachers will invariably mount have to be anticipated by careful study of their underlying philosophies.

Romantics and Reactionaries

What, then, are some of the main objectives, ideologies and curricular philosophies which underly such a highly contested term as 'English'? Two main categories can be identified as far as current philosophies of English teaching are concerned: 'Romantics' and 'Reactionaries'. The romantic camp is in the majority. The reactionaries are probably the more vociferous, at least, in certain places such as the pages of many national newspapers (and especially in letters to *The Radio Times*), but I hope to show that the romantics are in some respects more dangerous.

'Romantics' and 'Reactionaries' are, of course, not exclusive categories, but rather tendencies or orientations. Along such a cline most applied linguists would probably occupy a position somewhere in the middle of these two poles. It is, however, as I have already pointed out, a position which has only been tentatively and temporarily occupied. Linguists should be in little doubt, however, that for many English teachers, they are unequivocably in the reactionary camp. On the other hand, for those holding reactionary views of English teaching, linguists are often seen as irredeemably romantic, capable of only the most laissez-faire attitudes to language, and culpable of the most anarchic forms of relativism.[1]

In this paper I intend to attempt to characterise these opposing tendencies, particularly with regard to views of language, in the following general terms. With regard to **reactionary** views, we find:

(i) A prescriptive view of language which manifests itself in a concern with grammatical correctness, accurate spelling and punctuation, and so on. Pedagogically, such a view would be accompanied by regular tests and exercises in the correct forms with a heavy reliance on memorization as a learning procedure, and on copying and dictation. A comic version of such prescriptivism is Keith Waterhouses's witty remark that he would die a happy man if the Kingman committee could prevent his greengrocer from putting apostrophes in potato's, tomato's, orange's and so on.

(ii) Underlying this view is a belief that language can and should be stabilized and codified as a series of rules to be followed and to be taught accordingly.

(iii) An essentially historical view of language and social reality. The above concern with order and organisation also represents a resistance to change in

3
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

language. This in turn leads to a static, synoptic, product-centred perspective regarding language and language use. The position is particularly well characterised in Milroy and Milroy (1985) *Authority in Language*. Connected with this is a general lack of tolerance of linguistic variation, including dialectal, and a commitment to the idea of a single homogeneous *standard* English. Given that written English is generally more resistant to change, there is a pedagogical focus on writing development, and on acquisition of written norms; there is much less attention given to oral competence and oracy in general.

The Newbolt Report of 1921 is particularly characterised by reactionaryism, as can be seen from the quotations below. We should also note that a resistance to change and a desire for linguistic homogeneity (irrespective of the facts of diversity) simultaneously embodies a *socially* reactionary adherence to keeping things the way they are. Views of language and views of social reality are never very far apart, but, above all, this position is worth noting for it is one which is particularly markedly at odds with the social philosophies of those teachers who embrace romantic views of the nature of English teaching.

"We state what appears to us to be an incontrovertible primary fact, that for English children no form of knowledge can take precedence over a knowledge of English, no form of literature can take precedence of English Literature: and that the two are so inextricably connected as to form the only basis possible for a national education.

[There should be]...systematic training in the use of standard English, to secure clearness and correctness both in oral expression and in writing

In France, we are told, this pride in the national language is strong and universal...such feeling for our own native language would be a bond of union between classes, and would beget the right kind of national pride. Even more certainly should pride and joy in the national literature serve as such a bond."

(*The Newbolt Report (1921)*, pp.14-22)

Let us turn now to an examination of more **romantic** curricular philosophy of English teaching. An archetypal expression of this is in the following extract from a widely cited book by Peter Medway:

"Although English may well have introduced into the curriculum certain important topics which would not have got there under the programmes of the other subjects, it is not the topic-list that gives English its identity, but the sort of knowledge that is involved *within* the topics. English is about working on the knowledge we have acquired from the unsystematic processes of living, about giving expression to it and making it into a firmer and more conscious kind of knowledge. This is done through language, expressive and informal language in the first place, and eventually language akin to that of

literature. Our students work through language on their own knowledge, and also gain access to other people's knowledge by way of their language, that is, through literature: we learn from literature in something like the way we do from working over our own experience.

The fact that it is literature that provides the model for the expression of knowledge in English, brings us to another of the distinctive features of that knowledge. A chemistry teacher embarking on a topic with a class will usually be able to specify what the detailed content of the work will be and what learning is expected to result. For the English teacher, the detailed content, since a large part of it will come from the students, is unpredictable, and so, therefore, is the resulting learning. But quite apart from the unpredictability, even if English teachers wanted to specify the knowledge they hoped would result, they would be unable to. The sort of knowledge that is involved is not specifiable. That is why there are no English textbooks - in the sense of books which lay out the knowledge which the subject is centrally about. Other teachers can give a statement of what they want the students to know: the task then is, in a sense, to make that statement into a psychological awareness in the student. But what students end up knowing, as a result of their English work, about, say people's motiviations, could never be set out as a series of propositions; instead, it would have to be revealed by the way, for instance, they handle characters in their stories. The knowledge can only be displayed by being brought to bear on particular real or imagined situations - as happens in literature.

Thus the knowledge which is handled in English is of a different kind from that which is explicitly taught in the other subjects and enshrined in their formulas, facts and texts."

(*Finding a Language: Autonomy and Learning in School* (1980)

This quotation illustrates the first of seven observations I want to make about romanticism:

(i) A Subject with no Knowledge Content

English is a subject without any specifiable content. In English lessons there is no knowledge to be imparted to children; instead children come *to* the knowledge, of their own accord as it were. If the knowledge had to be quantified, then it would have to be by reference to experiential knowledge, the development of a knowledge of life. The pedagogic outcomes of such a position are a widespread refusal to contemplate the possibility of a syllabus for English.

(ii) English as an Art not a Science

English is by definition opposed to science. Science is seen as dealing with *facts* and therefore, as having a determinable knowledge content. Scientific subjects are seen as essentially mechanistic and anti-creative. (This is, of

course, a fallacious view of science which is a process of creative hypothesis building and hypothesis modification with no ultimately verifiable 'facts'; however, such is the established view of science adopted by English teachers). This view of English explains the failure of English teachers to develop 'language across the curriculum' projects of the kind proposed by the Bullock Report (1975). Most English teachers unconsciously resist the notion that they should in any way assume a servicing role, especially to scientific subjects.

(iii) Anti-Formalization

Related to both the above positions is an opposition to technicality or formalization. There will thus be a strong aversion to what is seen as the 'metalanguage' or jargon of linguistics and language-based discussion. (This is, of course, an untenable position since English literary studies are redolent with terms such as rhyme, iambic pentameter, omniscient narrator, and the like. This is a simple case of metalanguages being naturalised in one's own subject area - jargon is always somebody else's jargon, - but this does not mean that anti-formalization is not a very prevalent attitude among English teachers). Rules, technical terms and the like are associated with scientific discourse and are to be avoided lest they impose 'mind-forged manacles' on children and possibly hinder their personal growth. Such avoidance suggests some reasons for the lack of enthusiasm for the teaching of grammar with its associated rules and terminologies.

(iv) Individualism

Individuals and individualism are central to Romantic ideologies. As the reference to 'mind-forged manacles' in the previous section demonstrates (a much-used quotation from the Romantic poet, William Blake), there should be no conformity to rules or to the requirements of a social organization and especially so if that social organization is in any way connected with commercial or business interests. Individual pupils cannot be in any way constrained as individuals. They must not become cogs in a production line.

The pedagogic outcomes of the general positions outlined at (iii) and (iv) above, are as follows: an emphasis on creative writing, rather than on pre-formulation; a concern for children to write in their own words, and to choose the language and forms they require for individual expression. There will be greater attention to writing as a process in which there is minimal structural intervention by a teacher. Such pedagogies are essentially child-centred with children making their own meanings as individual creative beings, and as far as possible, in their own words. The possible dangers of childism inherent in this particular position will be outlined later.

(v) Dualization of Language and Meaning

The strong belief in this connection is again an essentially Romantic one. It is that language is preceded by content; that is, ideas originate independently of forms of expression and ultimately shape the choices of language and form needed to convey those ideas. In this view, then, language is only a channel, a conduit for the transmission of meanings. Such a view manifests itself in metaphors such as: *put into words*; *get your thoughts across*; *the statement was impenetrable*; the sentence was *filled with emotion*. Ideas are objects and words are merely the containers for them. Language is thus packed with ideas and sent down the conduit to a hearer.

The pedagogic consequences here are an emphasis in teaching on *what* is said, rather than on how it is said. Individually distinctive content takes precedence over the linguistic organization and structuring of content. This view of a dualization of language and meaning leads to classroom practices which presume that students who have difficulties with writing are actually struggling to make sense of content, rather than struggling to develop the language necessary to achieve an appropriate mastery of that content.

(vi) Independence of Language and Cognition

Many teachers share the attitudes of the wider community in this regard, viewing student's mental capacities and abilities as independent from the patterns of language in which these abilities are expressed. There is a tendency to look *beyond* or *past* language, as it were; teachers tend to imagine that independently-operating cognitive abilities control the ways students perform in school, and that these abilities by their nature cannot change. There is a clear connection here with the previous observation concerning the relationship between language and content; the pedagogic outcome is an unwillingness to provide pupils with the linguistic means to undertake particular cognitive tasks. Those pupils that can do it, it is assumed, are able to do so because they can do it, not because they have or have not got the means to do it.

(vii) Literature as a resource

Ezra Pound argued that literature was a way of keeping words living and accurate: English teachers, too, are concerned with the emotional, imaginative and 'spiritual' development of the pupil. They are engaged in exploring and manipulating the blossoming inter-dependence of reading, talking, listening and writing:

> Reading, writing, talking about writing and talking in order to write, must be continual possibilities: they overlap and interlock[1].

The confidence in the modes of language which good teachers of English generate in their pupils, enables them to 'know' the world and themselves more completely. Kafka commented:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

'A book or a poem must be an ice-axe to break the sea frozen inside us'

> "If you accept the fundamental truth beyond this startling image, it is clear that English is deeply concerned with the aesthetic, the creative and the spiritual. Moreover, we are responsible for helping to develop within pupils the ability to participate sympathetically and constructively in society. This must involve an understanding of political, social and ethical issues and, most importantly, the ability to 'use' languages with confidence - in order to learn, communicate and exploit life to its full."
> (*Writing and the Writer*, Frank Smith, 1982)[1]
> from Richard Knott - *The English Department in a Changing World (1985)*

The centrality of literature as a resource is the cornerstone of Romantic philosophy in so far as it affects the English classroom. This is illustrated in the above quotation. Indeed, as Raymond Williams reminds us in *Keywords*[2] the use of the term literature is a romantic invention which is still prevalent today. In the eighteenth century, the word literature was used to refer to writing in the broadest sense of the word: diaries, essays, travelogues, etc. The sense is retained today in phrases such as travel or insurance 'literature'. Its romantic, nineteenth century meaning is of texts highly valued for their originality and creativity, and for their expression of a unique vision. It can be seen that the high value placed on literariness in writing, affects the kind of writing which pupils are expected to produce in schools and which is, in turn, positively regarded by their English teachers.

Literature, then, is a resource in which feeling and imagination find expression. It is also a repository of values greatly prized for their potential civilizing effects; it is a resource beyond the merely functional, instrumental and utilitarian. It is instead a resource for the development of imaginative, emotional, spiritual and even moral capacities. Above all, it fosters a critical perspective on existing social and ideological practices. Powerful literary texts are, either implicitly or explicitly, profoundly critical of societal structures, and of the value systems which support or are, in turn, supported by them. And the word critical here embraces both positive and negative senses.

The pedagogies which result from this view of the centrality of literature will not be difficult to discern. They include: a limited generic range of writing in the English classroom, and a corresponding paucity of engagement with non-literary discourses. A marked focus is on the writing of stories and of narratives of personal experience in particular. For example, my own son (aged nine) produced thirty-four pieces of written work last year in his junior school. Of these, thirty-two were narratives of personal experience. Of the remaining two, one was a report and the other a letter; both of these were heavily based on narrative

organization. At more advanced levels, the institutionalization of the subject, for example, at 'A' level, is that of a study of literary texts. In the 'A' level curriculum it will probably not surprise anyone to learn that the most widely studied paper is *English Literature 1790-1830: English Romantic Poets*. The wheel comes full circle.

I shall conclude this all too brief discussion of the impregnation of English teaching in this country with Romantic-idealist philosophies by quoting one of the clearest expressions of it which I have recently encountered. The quotation is taken from the annual address to N.A.T.E. this year (1987) by its Chairperson, Henrietta Dombey. The talk, which merits much fuller study, is reprinted, in part, in *Times Educational Supplement* (1.5.87):

> "It is hardly surprising that teachers of English are an irritant to government. Whether we take a Leavisite stance on the civilizing value of literature, see English as primarily concerned with personal growth, or treat both language and literature as cultural phenomena through which the structures of society can be explored, we are clearly not in the business of teaching our pupils to be obedient workers, docile citizens and eager consumers.
>
> Instead, we are primarily concerned with putting our pupils in charge of their own lives. Learning to be sensitive to the ways others use language, which means, in part, to recognize manipulation, deception and coercion, and thus to protect our pupils from exploitation. Active reading of powerful literary texts which pupils can relate in some way to their own experience, enlarges their understanding of the world and its possibilities. Using their own language in speech and writing, with effectiveness, imagination and a sensitivity to the needs of the situation, enables pupils to refine their thoughts, experiences and intentions, and to make these clear to themselves and others. The teaching of English is powerful stuff."

This is, in essence, an expression of Romantic values. Like many Romantic values, it imparts an importance to all who profess them. It embraces English teachers as sensitive rebels, as custodians of individuality against impersonalizing forces, as the instillers of civilizing and of critical capacities. Who would not like to be in possession of such powerful stuff, and who would not want to resist such powers being removed and being replaced by a linguistic utilitarianism as it is feared the Kingman committee may intend?

The main problem, for me, with such a profession, is that it comes close to saying English teachers can teach anything. This is in paradoxical contrast to the objections raised by English teachers to the statement that 'all teachers are teachers of English'. The dangers of English teachers playing many different tunes, has been pointed out perceptively by Michael Stubbs in an article published in 1982. Stubbs argues that models of English teaching:

> "...appear to make English teachers responsible not only for the linguistic

development of their pupils, but also for their psychological, moral and interpersonal development - and to expect them also to provide a world view and a philosophy of life."[3]

The view of English teaching as psychotherapy, social criticism, uniquely individual creative expression, the repository of civilized values, as well as of language development, leaves many applied linguists bewildered. But, if a more linguistic view is to become prevalent, it is clearly essential for this romantically-orientated view to be understood and to be argued with or against. It cannot be either dismissed or assumed not to exist. If there is to be a sufficient curricular space for a properly coherent English language education, English teachers must feel that it is worth doing. For it to have worth, such work must be recognized to square in some respect with their existing concerns. It must embrace romantic ideologies without in any way appearing to proclaim reactionary positions either in 'content' or methodology.

Ways Forward: Developments in Curricular Genres

I will turn now to two recent developments:

1. Australian work on genre and curricular genres
2. Recent developments in 'A' level English language

which may offer some grounds for optimism, and which may provide a way in which language education can move forward. The first development touches on relevant models of language in education through English; the second development touches on the kind of language study which may be appropriate in schools - both developments thus fall within the Kingman committee brief.

I want to argue that there *is* potential for a synthesis between the extreme positions of romantics and reactionaries, which still establishes and enunciates clear working and defensible principles. I want to argue that what is required is an approach to language which recognises and reconciles two main complementary features:

- the potential of language for creativity and for the generation of critical and personal meanings;
- the systematic regularity of its patterns

I shall begin with genre research. First I must point out, that research in this domain in Australia, often properly involving linguist and teacher, is extensively funded at state and government levels. The arguments about the teaching of grammar, so strident here, have long since passed in Australia. The understanding there is that grammar is only part of meaning. If it is only taught in isolated sentences and not as part of connected text, and if it is not related to semantic options, then, it is no wonder Australian teachers of English point out, research is inconclusive concerning the effects of grammar on writing performance.

By *genre* is meant what Professor Michael Halliday calls 'staged, purposive, goal-directed language activity'. There are spoken and written genres, but most of the descriptive work which proposes lexical, syntactic and discoursal recognition criteria, has been on written curricular genres. Examples of curricular genres are: narrative, argumentation, summary, report, exposition recount, description.

There is still much research to be done. For example, research is needed to find out exactly what are the predominant genres used in business, industry, public service, and trades union contexts. And there is still much descriptive work required, especially at the inter- sentential, discoursal levels of generic organisation, though much revealing and encouraging work is going on as part of the Joint Matriculation Board-funded SAIL project at the University of Manchester, as well as much relevant research in ESP text analysis by John Swales and others. But we are now at a position where teachers can begin to be helped to recognise the different degrees of linguistic organization of different genres and can use such recognition in their teaching if they can be persuaded to do so. How can they be persuaded? What sort of arguments have to be presented? How might the Kingman committee have to make such a case? I feel that, at least, the following arguments need to be mounted: The first point to have to make is that descriptive analysis and the provision of appropriate linguistic descriptive frameworks is for *teachers*, not for pupils. Pupils only get exposure to these analytical models if it is the teacher's judgement that they should. It is up to the teachers to devise appropriatee pedagogies to allow pupils to acquire the requisite generic competence. This kind of language development does definitely require teacher-intervention, but it does not mean a return to prescriptive didactic teaching with a teacher-centred transmissive imparting of rules.

Secondly, children do not generally learn generic knowledge that is, how to write a report or construct an argument, for themselves. It is not knowledge they come to. Of course, some children will learn genres for themselves, by a kind of osmosis. These will usually be the bright middle-class children. English teachers have to recognise that it is insufficient to leave such work in the hands of careers-teachers (many of whom are inappropriately trained) and that a romantic Wordsworthian *childism* inheres in, as is frequently the case, focusing exclusively on experiential genres such as narrative in the belief that children are not ready (until the fourth or fifth year of secondary school) for other kinds of generic writing. A belief in the dualization of content and linguistic form, and of the separability of language and cognition can lead very easily to a dangerous assumption that children are not cognitively capable of such knowledge, let alone of the linguistic skills which accompany them.

Thirdly, by not teaching a wider range of genres, large numbers of children are being *disempowered*. They are being denied access to what Bernstein now

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

terms a set of 'coding orientations' without which they cannot hope to compete on equal terms for jobs which require this kind of comprehensive discursive practice. By focusing in such narrow generic terms, children are being denied access to the kinds of social power that comes with articulacy in a range of written styles, especially in argumentation, and in factual expository writing. English teachers have to be convinced that there is little point in providing English lessons in the development of critical social analysis if pupils are simultaneously denied access to language skills which might enable them to change social realities for themselves and for others. Much current English teaching practice is disempowering. It is done unconsciously, with the very best of Romantic motives, but it is still disempowering.

Fourth, the importance for English teachers of children's *choice* in the expression of meanings and of the development of appropriate facilitating pedagogies, has to be respected. But the argument has to be that romanticism is leading to a restriction of choice, for, however rich the meanings a narrative can release, it cannot equal the sum of the meanings made available by other genres. In a related way, too, it can be argued that expressivity involves manipulation of rules - particularly at the highest levels of creativity. Knowledge of the rules has to precede the creative exploitation of them. One of the many Romantic fallacies is that creativity takes place in a vacuum. The throes of creation or whenever the moment takes you, be it at 4 o'clock in the morning, or whenever, cannot only be related to the 'accidental' arrival of the man from Porlock. The very existence of many drafts through which creative work passes is testimony to its being highly structured.

Fifth, the development of generic competence in pupils can and should be organically related to *literary* text study. This is a relatively straightforward matter, since genre is a literary concept and will be understood in such terms by English teachers. In order to be sensitive to the relationship between literariness and genre, it is important to emphasise to teachers a clear recognition that genres are rooted in an historical, evolutionary framework. Genres change and evolve. They are dynamic, rather that static, categories; they lend themselves to creative embedding (especially in literary texts), and to patterned reformulation. But they are also fundamentally instances of languages being systematically patterned. They occupy a curricular space between reactionaryism and romanticism: between language as a creative resource and language as patterned regularity.

Developments in English Language 'A' Level

For many years, English 'A' level meant an advanced level course in English Literature. Things are changing, and three examination boards (AEB, JMB and University of London), now offer an 'A' level in English Language Studies.

Such courses are gaining rapidly in popularity, and it is worth exploring some of the reasons for this, particularly since language study has not previously been noted for its broad appeal to students and teachers of English. To do so will also hopefully be to reveal interesting points of comparison with arguments for increased attention to the category of genre in the English curriculum.

It may, however, be instructive first of all to compare language study from different periods, since historical reflections are always revealing. Compare, for example, the following two questions: one from a General Secondary Education paper in 1946, the other from a G.C.E. 'A' Level English Language paper forty years later. Both papers are from the University of London Board.

Question 1

(a) Analyse into clauses the following passage.
Give the grammatical description of the clauses and show their connection with each other:

In that year (1851) when the Great Exhibition spread its hospitable glass roof high over the elms of Hyde Park, and all the world came to *admire* England's wealth, progress and enlightenment, there might *profitably* have been another 'exhibition' to show how our poor were housed and to teach the admiring foreign visitors *some* of the dangers *that* beset the path of the vaunted new era.

(b) State the grammatical features of the words italicized in (a).

Question 2

In February 1984 all the national daily newspapers reported an incident which occurred at a colliery in Northumberland. The participants involved were the chairman of the National Coal Board (Mr. Ian MacGregor), miners and policemen.

The following reports from four of the daily papers deal with the same events, but are contrasted in their interpretation of what took place, and offer their readers different impressions.

(i) Examine and discuss the language of the reports in terms of their choices of vocabulary and grammar, and in the ordering of the events described. Relate these choices to the differences of interpretation presented by the papers, with reference to both the headlines and the reports.

(ii) Discuss some of the problems which may arise in 'reporting the facts' of a news item accurately and impartially. Say which of the reports seems to you to be prejudiced either for or against any of the participants, referring in detail to the linguistic evidence for your judgements. Discuss at least three reports in some detail.

Space allows only a limited number of observations. The first paper is characterised by a classification of linguistic forms as an end in itself, and by concern with precise definition, in an appropriate metalanguage, which draws on a presupposed knowledge of particular rule-governed grammatical features. The second paper is more directly concerned with language *in use*, seeking by a process of comparison to bring out distinctive features of language functions and is, above all, alert to the ways in which language patterns and so mediates ideologies. The point of the exercise is not simply a classification of linguistic forms, though this has to be done in a detailed and accurate way using an appropriate metalanguage, but also a critical reading of the ways in which such forms are deployed at the interface of language and social realities.

Other questions in the same paper involve students in describing different styles, in analysing the functions of different social and geographical dialects, in re-writing a piece of seventeenth century prose into modern English, in analysing the vocabulary patterns in a poem, and in pointing out the different social and political values which attach to written and spoken discourse. Parallel papers from the JMB board involve students in a systematic exploration of the language of popular fiction, in creative writing exercises, and in the collection of naturally-occurring language data for writing up as language projects. There are also overt attempts in the syllabus of both boards to integrate rather than divorce language and literary studies. Schools following such syllabuses report what they describe as 'wash-back' effects in other areas of the English curriculum in the development of language awareness programmes for junior forms, for example. What might be some of the lessons to be drawn from these activities?

One of the possible reasons for the interest of English teachers in language studies is that such syllabuses start from where English teachers currently are. Such language study

(i) is non-prescriptive
(ii) is concerned with language variation and language change
(iii) is not neglectful of literary text and the development of sensitivity to literary language
(iv) is designed to foster critical insight into language *use* and help students unmask ideologies
(v) encourages student-centred, project-based investigations
(vi) adopts a functionalist, rather than formalist, perspective on language.

As with the Australian work for and with teachers on the description and teaching of written curricular genres, we may have a basis here for a model of language which accords with particular aspects of Romantic ideology. In particular, it seems designed to foster skills of critical interpretation and close reading of all texts; at the same time, it attends to the systematic patterning of language

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and expects students to be able to analyse such patterns without adopting the decontextualised, prescriptive, formal rule-spotting exercises characteristic of the grammar lessons feared by the English teaching profession.

Above all there is a balance established between reactionary and romantic poles, between language as patterned regularities and language as a creative resource.

Conclusion

The title of this paper *Some Pawns for Kingman* reflects the necessary limitation on a paper given in a context such as this. But pawns are useful pieces in both openings and end games, and it is hoped that some of the ideas and examples produced here may be of some ultimate use in an overall strategy, especially one of mounting strong arguments for a higher profile language study and skills in English teaching. I hope I have suggested that there are some grounds for optimism that this may happen.

I shall conclude by trying to outline briefly the other issues that I have not dealt with at all in this paper. At the least I have not discussed the following vital issues: language in relation to multicultural education; the relationship between first and second language development; the insidious dangers of 'permeation' models for 'language' and 'multicultural education' in teacher training courses; the importance of oracy and of assessment of performance through talk. I also wanted to draw attention to the fact that much argumentation in this whole domain, including many of my examples, is often necessary anecdotal. I hope to have suggested some powerful arguments for a more language-based English curriculum, but we cannot ignore the prevalence of numerous arguments chasing little evidence.

This leads to the need for substantial funded research in the area of language in education. I would like to see major projects into:

(i) the relationship between 'knowing that' and 'knowing how', particularly in relation to writing development;
(ii) grammar teaching, text formation and writing development;
(iii) further descriptions of *genres* of written and spoken English.

Of the above observations I would like to see development and encouragement by the Kingman committee of appropriate materials for classroom language work, and for teacher training courses. Not since the *Language in Use* materials developed in the early seventies, has there been any consistent and principled development of language materials for the lower secondary school, although books by Newby, Forsyth and Wood, and Wiley and Dunk are isolated exceptions. Similarly, with the exception of Open University courses such as PE232 *(Language Development)*, there is nothing in Britain which even remotely approaches the Deakin University distance-teaching modules in linguistics and

language learning (developed in the State of Victoria, Australia) for their sophistication and systematic principled approach, and for their rich methodological suggestions. Teachers often only start thinking and re-thinking their subject by exploring course books and experimenting with approaches developed on in-service programmes. Our B.Ed. and P.G.C.E. courses rarely move beyond the kind of course books and theories of English teaching which embrace literature-centred romantic ideologies. It is all too easy to rebuke; and yet the range, diversity and coherence of linguistics applied to teacher training courses for English as a second language, and to teaching materials for English as a second language, provides a nonetheless embarrassing situation for applied linguists committed to mother-tongue language education. Appropriate models for adaptation are often under our noses.

I will conclude by detecting notes of optimism and pessimism in the current debate. Judging from the reception of previous government committee reports, the signs for Kingman may not be particularly auspicious. The lobby from English teachers, especially those most committed to a romantic vision, is very powerful indeed, and cannot be underestimated, let alone discounted.

If language education in English teaching is to move forward, it must be by a thorough understanding of the position of the majority of English teachers, and by the mounting of powerful arguments which exploit the weaknesses and build on the strengths of what I have designated romantic and reactionary tendencies. If such a synthesis can be constructed in a principled manner with concrete examples in support, then those applied linguists interested in English studies may begin to occupy a radical curricular space with exciting possibilities, not least, for the development of English language programmes, but also for the development of a broader education through 'English'.

Notes

1. See in particular the reception given in the national press to the publication of Peter Trudgill's *Accent, Dialect and the School* (London: Edward Arnold, 1975), reported and catalogued in Milroy, J and L. (1985) *Authority in Language* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).
2. Raymond Williams, (1976) *Keywords*, (London: Fontana).
3. Michael Stubbs, 'What is English?' in R A Carter (ed.) (1982) *Linguistics and the Teacher* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).
4. For example, Newby, M (1982) *Making Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Forsyth, I J and Wood, K (1980) *Language and Communication* (London: Longman); Wiley, G and Dunk, M (1985) *Integrated English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
5. *Language and Education* Course materials, Frances Christie (ed.) (Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carter, R A (ed.) (1982) *Linguistics and the Teacher* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Christie, R (ed.) (1985-) *Language and Education Series* (Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press)

Forsyth, I and Wood, K (1980) *Language and Communication* (London: Longman)

Milroy, J and Milroy, L (1985) *Authoritiy in Language* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Newby, M (1982) *Making Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stubbs, M (1982) 'What is English?' in Carter, R A (ed) pp.137

Trudgill, P (1975) *Accent, Dialect and the School* (London: Edward Arnold)

Wiley, G and Dunk, M (1985) *Integrated English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Williams, R (1976) *Keywords* (London: Fontana)